RESEARCH AND WORKING PAPERS ▫ 26

EVALUATING WINNIPEG'S UNICITY: THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ACT REVIEW COMMITTEE, 1984-1986

Phil H. Wichern

INSTITUTE OF URBAN STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

Phil H. Wichern

Phil H. Wichern is a Faculty Associate of the Institute of Urban Studies and a member of the Political Studies Department of the University of Manitoba. He has published numerous studies on government in Winnipeg, including articles in the Urban History Review/Revue d'histoire urbaine and two collections: The Development of Urban Governmentin the Winnipeg Area (1973) and Studies in Winnipeg Politics (1976). Dr. Wichern is continuing his research on municipal government and administration in Winnipeg since the advent of Unicity.

103-07235/

EVALUATING WINNIPEG'S UNICITY:

THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ACT REVIEW COMMITTEE, 1984-1986*

Research and Working Paper No. 26

Phil H. Wichern

Institute of Urban Studies

1986

* This monograph is a revised version of a paper prepared for a session at the 1986 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, held at the University of Manitoba, June 6, 1986. The author wishes to thank all those who assisted through their providing information and comments.

PUBLICATION DATA

Wichern, P.H.

Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity: the City of Winnipeg Act Review Committee, 1984-1986

(Research and working paper; no. 26)

ISBN: 0-920213-33-2

1. Winnipeg (Man.) - Politics and Government. I. University of Winnipeg. Institute of Urban Studies. II. Title III. Series: Research and working papers (University of Winnipeg. Institute of Urban Studies); 26.

This publication was partially supported by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, but the views expressed are the personal views of the author, and the corporation accepts no responsibility for them.

Copyright 1986
Institute of Urban Studies

ISBN: 0-920213-33-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
Table of Contents		iii
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND ITS WORK	2
	2.1 Why was The Committee Formed, and Who were the Members of the Committee?	3
	2.2 Who were the Members of the Review Committee, and How Did They Compare with the Members of the Earlier Committee of Review?	4
	2.3 What were the Routines, Special Events, and Politics of the Committee's Operations?	6
3.0	THE REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT	10
	3.1 What was the Nature of the Review Committee's Report?	10
	3.2 What were its Major Recommendations?	13
4.0	REACTIONS, THE PRESENT, AND THE FUTURE	15
	4.1 What were the Initial Reactions to the Committee's Report?	15
	4.2 What was the Mayor's Analysis?	16
	4.3 What Subsequently Happened to the Report and Its Recommendations?	19
	4.4 Where Do We Go From Here?	20
5.0	EVALUATING THIS COMMITTEE'S WORK AND REPORT IN THE CONTEXT OF EVALUATING UNICITY	20
6.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	23
NOTES		24
BIBLIOGRAPHY		27
APPENDIX		28

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Winnipeg's "Unicity" form of city-metropolitan government officially replaced twelve municipalities and the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg on January 1, 1972. Since before its inception, it has been widely recognized as a unique innovation in metropolitan government reform.[1] Few of these evaluations, however, called Unicity a success. In fact, one expert described it as "largely...a failure,"[2] while two local professionals characterized it as "the illusion of reform."[3] Brownstone and Plunkett have described at length the deviations from the original design during the policy formulation and legislating of the City of Winnipeg Act, and the lack of provincial direction in the nascent development of Unicity's actual operations.[4] A provincial Committee of Review (the "Taraska" Committee), appointed in 1975, found numerous problems in Unicity's political structure which it attributed to the failure of the provincial government to fully implement what it understood to be the ideas of the original designers, what it argued was inherent in Winnipeg City politics since 1919, and what it viewed as the developing trend in other cities: local governance by party politics, within a framework of what it called "quasi-parliamentary" municipal government.[5] Is Unicity an unsuccessful, albeit widely recognized metropolitan government innovation?

The author has previously demonstrated that these negative evaluations were the products of evaluation frameworks which possess serious conceptual and empirical flaws when they (instead of just Unicity) are carefully evaluated.[6] They judge Unicity in terms of whether it lived up to the original designers' intentions, abstract notions of local accountability and responsibility through local party government, and unrealistic assumptions about how much local political behaviour can be changed by institutional and legal (ie. "structural") reforms. They neglect not only the realities of provincial and local politics, but they also fail to discuss Unicity's achievements and the dedicated efforts of many elected and non-elected officials, civic employees, local groups, and ordinary residents who have "made Unicity work."

These evaluations were mostly based upon data collected and analyzed prior to major changes made by the provincial government in 1977, including the

reduction of wards from 50 to 29 and the reduction of Communities from 12 to 6, corresponding to the same number of public works districts. Since 1977 numerous amendments to the Act were passed and the provincial government had changed twice. Politics at City Hall also changed over the years and Unicity developed in the scope and cost of its operations.

What has been the record of urban governing under Unicity? What are the fair and realistic standards against which Unicity's performance can be measured? What, if any, adjustments to the Act and in Unicity's practices of government should be made? These questions became practically relevant in 1984 when the provincial government announced creation of a second committee to review the City of Winnipeg Act and Unicity's performance. Therefore, this author began a series of research projects directed toward supporting and assisting in that Committee's work.[7] This work continues the research designed to answer the original research questions, as well as providing a record of what the Committee did, what the Report it produced contained, and what the reactions were to its work and its Final Report. The following empirical research questions were asked: "why was this Committee formed when it was, and who were the members of the Committee?," "What were the routines, special events, and politics of its operations?," "What was the nature of its Report and major recommendations?," "What were the reactions to the Committee's work and the Report?," and "Where do we go from here?" The answers to these questions are reported in the sections which follow, based on personal interviews, observation, content analysis of documents, and media monitoring by the author from April, 1984 to May, 1986. A final major section attempts to analyze, compare, and interpret the research data gathered in terms of the broader original questions indicated at the beginning of this paragraph.

2.0 THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

This section provides a description of the Committee's formation, composition, operations, and some of the politics associated with its work.

The more detailed chronology in Appendix 1 provides the data base for answering the research questions addressed in this section.

2.1 Why was the Committee Formed, and Who Were the Members of the Committee?

The political pressures for another review had been building for several years. After a period of more or less "benign neglect" under the Lyon Progressive Conservative Government (1979-1981), a higher profile was given to Winnipeg urban problems and civic affairs under the New Democratic Party Government which won the provincial election of November, 1981. Under the direction of several energetic Urban Affairs Ministers, it separated the Department of Urban Affairs from Municipal Affairs again, and initially it appeared that an improvement in provincial-City relations would develop. But there were also major differences of orientation and priorities which soon erupted in public controversies such as that over Plan Winnipeg. It was the product of a Tri-Level project begun in 1976. Completed by 1980, its final approval was held up by provincial-City conflicts from 1982 to early, 1986. Not surprisingly, the 1984 Review Committee was specifically directed to examine "city planning, particularly in Part XX of the Act," as well as "the distribution of responsibilities and powers between the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba." (The entry in Appendix 1 after 11 April, 1984 provides a more complete description of the Committee's mandate). Other irritants germaine to this study included a large number of City-proposed amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act on which the Province had acted (not even acknowledging some of them): and of amendments that were passed, some were not proclaimed as required in order to become law.

Another consideration was the length of time, seven years, since the government had responded to the Committee of Review's recommendations with over 100 amendments. Despite the disinclination to respond to City proposals, many more amendments had been incorporated into the Act during those years. Section 660 of the City of Winnipeg Act called for reviews "as often...(as the Government)...deems it necessary," but the five years between the passage of the Act and the first Committee had created, at least in some officials'

minds, the need for review every five to ten years. As well, there was also concern that the Act be re-evaluated in terms of how its provisions were being implemented in the changing contexts of additional zone development, resident involvement, and provincial-City fiscal relations in the 1980s.

The idea of a review of the Act was probably discussed in Cabinet as early as 1982. Apparently the experience of the Taraska Committee was considered normative, as other possible forums such as a Commission of Inquiry were rejected. The idea of a new committee reviewing the City of Winnipeg Act and Unicity apparently received at least initial favourable reactions from members of the City's Official Delegation in 1983, and at least a tacit willingness to co-operate in its formation (more details will be found in Appendix 1). Some Cabinet (and other N.D.P. M.L.A.s) may have had reservations based on experience with the French Language issue and the desire to avoid any possible irritants to a provincial election campaign, which had to be called sometime in the next few years. But the decision to go ahead with the review was finally made and after informal negotiations for suitable members for such a committee, and finally the official Order-In-Council, approved on 11 April, 1984. This Order was supplemented by one signed on June 20 which replaced one member of the Committee with another person--which brings us to the subject of who the Committee members were.

2.2 Who Were the Members of the Review Committee, and How Did They Compare with the Earlier Committee of Review?

Both committees' members were men. However, in contrast to the three-man Committee of Review formed in 1975, the new Review Committee was given five members. The earlier Committee's members were a local citizenship judge (Peter Taraska, who was Chairman), a Halifax mayor who became a political science professor in Ontario (Allan O'Brien), and a prominent local city planner (Earl Levin). In contrast, most of the 1984 Committee's members were local middle-age professionals who were known to have good political connections with provincial officials--several being challenged in the media as being "too partisan" to serve on the Committee. Lawrie Cherniack, designated chairperson (he later claimed to his surprise), was son of the main

political architect of Unicity and first Urban Affairs Minister, Saul Cherniack. Lawrie had cut his political teeth as one of the freshman class of new Councillors elected to Unicity's first Council in the fall of 1971, representing an inner-City ward. He had been active and articulate on Council and remained an active member in the municipal wing of the party after he did not run for Councillor in 1974, in order to develop his law career. He had been considered a contender for the municipal wing's nomination for Mayor in 1983 (when a mayoralty candidate was chosen for the first time in many years). Mr. Cherniacks's political connections served as part of the basis of early attacks on the Committee in the press, as well as the hostility and refusal to co-operate by City Councillors (who themselves had other party affiliations).

Dr. Alan Artibise had returned to Winnipeg in 1983 as a Professor of History and Urban Studies, as well as Director of the Institute of Urban Studies at The University of Winnipeg. He had considerable academic credentials as an urban historian and observer of Winnipeg's civic affairs. The Committee member with the broadest experience in urban affairs was Donald Epstein. He had studied, consulted on, or taught civic affairs in Denmark, the United States, and other places in Canada, as well as being a researcher at the Institute of Urban Studies in the 1970s. He had also worked with numerous local groups in Winnipeg. At the time of his appointment to the Committee he was a partner in I.D. Engineering Company of Winnipeg, with private and public clients which included the City, Core Area Initiative, a rural municipality in Winnipeg's additional zone, and developers. Dr. Paul G. Thomas was a colleague of the author in the Political Studies Department at the University of Manitoba, and the co-founder of the highly successful Masters of Public Affairs Program (a joint program with The University of Winnipeg). Although not specializing in local government, he had previous experience on a school board inquiry. He also had widespread contacts in government. The fifth member of the Committee, D.I. MacDonald, was appointed in June of 1984, prior to the Committee's first meeting, replacing a Labour union official whom one source suggested was not acceptable to the City. Mr. MacDonald may have come to the Minister or senior officials' attention because of a 34-page brief specifying Unicity problems and proposed changes which he sent to the Minister in 1983 when he heard that changes to the Act were

likely. In any case, MacDonald brought to the Committee an insider's working knowledge of both Unicity and pre-Unicity local administration in Winnipeg. He had been General Manager of the Greater Winnipeg Transit Commission in the 1950s, Director of Streets and Transit and then Executive Director of Winnipeg's Metropolitan Corporation in the 1960s, and the first Chief Commissioner of Unicity until he retired in 1978.

In addition to these members, two other persons participated in the Committee's work: David Sanders, former Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs, was designated as "Special Advisor to the Minister" with an assignment to assist the Committee in its work. Prior to the formation of the Committee, he oversaw the hiring of five students under a provincial summer work program (S.T.E.P.), and they prepared background papers for the Committee on the subjects the Government had indicated specific interest. Gordon Mackie was selected as Committee Secretary in August, 1984. Gordon had experience in senior provincial staff positions, and had either written or helped write various policy papers and provincial acts, although he had only limited experience and study in urban affairs. Along with Donald Epstein, Mackie would bear most of the responsibility for the final drafting of the Committee's Report and was especially helpful in preparing this paper.

2.3 What were the Routines, Special Events, and Politics of the Committee's Operations?

The routines of the committee's operations involved core staff activities, the setting up and holding of meetings, commissioning special studies and data-gathering, and attending to various public relations functions. The core staff activities included setting up an office with a leased computer/work processor, development of files, arranging of meetings, writing and arranging publications of the pamphlet (September, 1984) the "Issues Paper" (November, 1984), and the Final Report (finished draft, 3 December 1985).

The 15 public hearings scheduled for January to April, 1985 became 29, at which 216 submissions were made. These were transcribed and reproduced for Committee members (except for half of one hearing which a Committee member

inadvertantly erased). The Committee received 80 additional written submissions and met over 150 people in private.[8] In contrast, the previous Committee of Review in 1975-76 had heard only 74 oral submissions, received only 87 written briefs, and met privately with only 21 delegations or individuals.[9] A summary of the various individuals and groups either making presentations at the hearings or submitting written briefs is listed in the appendices of the Final Report.

In addition to the core staff activities and meetings, the Committee carried on a limited research program which included 11 commissioned papers and a commissioned public opinion poll (of 400 Winnipegers). The full list of these studies is found in Appendix III of the Committee's Final Report, but all remained part of the Committee files and were not published, despite Committee requests and an offer from The Institute of Urban Studies to publish them at no expense to the Government.

No attempt will here be made to describe in full the internal politics of the Committee's operations. We should, however, note that from near the beginning of those operations various members took responsibility for researching and summarizing views on the six major issue areas designated in the Committee's issue paper: qualities of good government, citizen participation, the additional zone, provincial/municipal relations, political and administrative organization, and planning. Members of the Committee also took responsibility for specific ideas. For example, Lawrie Cherniack developed the idea of the ombudsman and municipal tribunal. Interviews also suggest that this Committee did not avoid the obvious problems inherent in obtaining consensus amongst five members and one or two other participants on final positions, recommendations, and wording. Some differences in views emerge in minority reports that are part of the "discussion" sections on 14 of the committee's 73 recommendations. The greatest dissenter was D.I. MacDonald who dissented on at least 17 separate points in regard to 12 (out of 73) recommendations. No other member dissented so often, but others joined MacDonald in dissents on at least four recommendations. On one recommendation, number 19, regarding single or multi-member wards, the Committee reported that it was divided almost evenly, with the tie-breaking

member favouring larger, multi-member wards only if proper public financing were quaranteed.[10] At points in the text there are also notable shifts from "we" (the Committee as a whole) to "the majority of the Committee" in the working of discussions on various other recommendations.

The Committee held over 30 meetings, used a modified Delphi technique, and exchanged numerous memorandums in its efforts to synthesize the data it had gathered, deal with strong personally held views, and accommodate Committee members' developing opinions on the topics under discussion. Some members of the Committee would remain unsure as to how successful and systematic an integration had been achieved. On the other hand, some felt the eclectic process and Final Report were a major asset differentiating this Committee from similar and previous efforts. At least one participant felt that the major lesson learned in this process was that "five was too large a committee."

The external politics of the Committee's work are indicated in Appendix 1. As noted there, in December, 1984 Winnipeg's Mayor Bill Norrie demanded Alan Artibise's removal from the Committee because of statements Artibise had made regarding the challenging of City assessments (a subject explicitly excluded from the Committee's scope of inquiry). Norrie threatened that civic officials would boycott the Committee's work, but the threats did not become actions. An N.D.P. Councillor took up the Mayor's cause in early January, 1985, but was persuaded to reverse himself and appear at the Committee's first public hearing, which the Mayor did boycott. Later the Mayor backed down on his threatened boycott of the Committee, and in April made an official presentation at one of the last public hearings; but some of the City Councillors, for whom this incident confirmed the inherent partisan nature of the Committee, refused to co-operate with the Committee.

The other City Councillors' responses ranged from enthusiastic support to avoidance of any participation. At least three appeared at more than one of the Committee's public hearings. Councillor Bill Neville, Assistant to the President and colleague of the author at the University of Manitoba, wrote a lengthy brief as well as an article in the major local paper. Others met with

the committee privately and/or responded to the Committee's survey of past and present Councillors (but only 16 of 89 eligible replied, severely limiting its usefulness). The Committee held private discussions with Councillors on its emerging proposals in the late spring of 1985, and some Committee members were upset that some of those ideas were criticized in media statements by the Mayor and some members of Council. The provincial Department of Urban Affairs saw the Committee as "independent," and held itself "at arms length," although it supported budget increases (to over $377,000) and the three-month extension of the deadline for the Final Report (from August 31 to November 30, 1985). Some of those most involved in the committee's work felt that the co-operation of the department had not been what it should have been in a number of specific instances. From initial hostility the Opposition attitude changed to involvement of some members in private discussion sessions with the Committee on its proposals. Certainly, the public responded positively to the Committee's invitation to participate, as the record of public hearings, briefs, and requests for information indicate.

According to the Report, a highpoint in the 29 public hearings came on March 13 at Rossbrook House, an inner-city native youth centre. That session started with native music and included the presentation of sixteen well-prepared briefs on inner-city problems, laced with striking testimony such as that of Sister Bernadette O'Reilly for the Inner City Committee for Rail Relocation. She argued that in Winnipeg "...planning has not been done by our elected city officials...but rather it's been done by a handful of developers in the boardrooms and the backrooms of corporate offices. The chief motivation, of course, has been money.... We believe that the core area funding program provides the City with an excuse to once again abdicate from its role of having to develop any kind of strategy for revitalizing the inner city...." Another brief concluded "...The needs of the inner city are not being met by the current government....It is our wish that something be done to create a government which is sensitive to these needs and which has the will to address them.[12]

Having concluded the public hearings in April, the Committee proceeded to focus on each of the questions it had earlier posed in its "Issue Paper,"

often using the options suggested there as points for discussion using a modified Delphi technique. Various members drafted initial versions of sections of the Report. For example, Paul Thomas was responsible for the first major section, "Provincial-Municipal Relations," and Donald Epstein for the planning and additional zone sections.

Other important dates and politics which could be identified are contained in Appendix 1, including events related to the Committee's work but occurring after its formal disbanding, right up to the writing of this paper in May, 1986. But before describing reactions and what is currently happening, let us look more carefully at the product of the Committee's work.

3.0 THE REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT

This section examines the result of the Committee's work: its Final Report. Readers who wish to obtain copies of the Final Report may do so from the Queen's Printer, Province of Manitoba, 200 Vaughan Street, Winnipeg (at an initial price of $7.00).

3.1 What was the Nature of the Review Committee's Report?

There are several initial observations to be made about the nature--the style, organization, writing--of the Final Report. First of all, as Committee members themselves noted it is not "an easy read." It is quite long (348 single-spaced pages in the typed final draft, 124 pages in the printed version), and most of its 73 recommendations are more than four sentences in length. Only thirty of the recommendations are less than four sentences in length, and many are more than four paragraphs long (the longest are those providing a detailed implementation schedule and establishing a Rivers Corporation). The format of the Report is that after four introductory sections, the recommendations are grouped around various themes into sections, each of which is introduced with an "Introduction and Summary." After these subsections, as the Committee notes: "We place the recommendation first, after which a discussion of that recommendation follows. We encourage the

reader to hold off judgement on each recommendation until she or he has read the discussion and understood the relationship to other recommendations." These often lengthy "Discussion" sections indicate Committee views and rationales for the recommendations, as well as dissents or individual Committee member comments. In the typed final draft of the Report, this format takes up almost 300 single-spaced pages, which reduces to about 100 pages in the printed version.

Although this Report contains about the same number of recommendations as the previous Committee's Report (it contained 71), its format is much more focused on individual recommendations. The previous Report used almost a third of its text to develop the case for its "modified parliamentary form of urban government," and another third to describe the proposed new structure. The remaining third was devoted to planning, zoning, environmental impact review, and provincial-municipal relations. The Report under consideration here begins with the latter, moves to what appears to be its major focus, Unicity's political organization, then treats other topics assigned to the Committee in the Order-In-Council (see Appendix 1, April 11, 1984, under c.i-v), although reference is not made to responding to these specifics after the formal display of the terms of reference.[13]

The way that the Report approaches its subject matter is to posit overarching criteria of good City government, describe problems, prescribe reforms (in the form of recommendations), and then provide the rationale for those solutions (in its "discussion" sections). In other words, most of the treatment lies in the realm of ideas and logic, with few specific references to hard evidence--including comments at hearings or in written briefs (which were frequently cited in the 1976 Report). The reader will not find many references to the views or data contained in the dozen studies commissioned by the Committee or to other hard data available to the committee, such as that on Resident Advisory Group participation, collected and published by the author.[14] As a result, it is difficult to challenge many specific facts or interpretations in the Report, apart from disagreeing with the views expressed. (An exception is one statistic that was cited later by the

Opposition Urban Affairs critic in the provincial legislature, requiring some explanation by the Committee members to the new Minister of Urban Affairs.)

It is also important to note that, like its predecessor, the Committee did not equally evaluate positive and negative features, accomplishments as well as problems. Rather, it focused its Report on "the system's major shortcomings" (it lists eleven of them at the outset of its "Political and Administrative Organization" section). In response to these problems, the Committee presents a lengthy set of major structural changes which would supposedly remedy those shortcomings. There are no formal recommendations of praise, and few comments regarding aspects of the Act that require no revisions. The closest the Committee comes to recognition of past achievements is illustrated by the following passage which appears before the statement of the Committee's approach, without development or further recognition in the rest of the Report: "Despite being under the microscope in one way or another for the past two and a half decades and having to adjust to some very dramatic changes, the City's political and administrative system has worked reasonably well. We cannot say on the basis of what we heard that there is widespread dissatisfaction among Winnipegers about the performance of their city government....Most people, we suspect, appraise city government on the basis of the reliability and the quality of the services they receive. In this regard, past reforms have served Winnipeg well...it is our impression that the services provided by the city's departments are generally sound and well managed. No one wants to sacrifice the gains achieved through the unification of services on a city-wide basis."[15]

In this context it should also be noted that the Report recommends not only numerous formal changes to sections in the Act, but also suggests many changes in provincial policies and procedures, many changes in City policies and procedures, and significant changes in the membership, policies and procedures of eleven civic boards, commissions, advisory committees, authorities, and corporations (recommendation 12). Another striking facet of the Committee's approach is the number of recommendations that suggest further study or creation of specialized institutional mechanisms as solutions. Thirteen new studies, task forces, committees, offices, and a municipal tribunal are

recommended. For example, a joint provincial-City review of financing is called for in recommendation #1, while #4 recommends "a joint City-Provincial task force," and #5 a formal provincial-City consultation mechanism. The key recommendation of the Report, #8, would create a new seven-member Executive Committee of City Council. Recommendation #10 would create a new Council position to be known as "Presiding Officer," while #13 would create a Council Compensation Commission, composed of five citizens. Recommendation #42 suggests formation of an Association of Winnipeg Region Municipalities to increase City-additional zone municipalities cooperation and planning, especially in land-uses and development. Recommendation #50 wants the Act to require City Council to establish City Records Committee to oversee civic information storage and archives. Recommendation #59 would create a City ombudsman, who could take injustices to a new municipal tribunal (recommendation #61) for final disposition. Later in the Report, there is a recommendation for a provincial study of the "the desirability and feasibility of consolidating or unifying school divisions within the City "(#70), and the Committee also recommends (#16 and 73) immediate appointment of a Boundaries Commission to radically change the ward and community boundaries within the City before the next civic election. There are several other such proposals which are omitted here.

In summary, this Report is a lengthy study document organized around 73 recommendations which address perceived problems in provincial-municipal relations, City political structure, City planning procedures, relations of the City with Rural Municipalities in the Additional Zone, and citizen access to information as well as redress when the City does not obey its own laws, in addition to other problems. The proposed solutions range from specific changes to the City of Winnipeg Act to numerous further studies and new governmental institutions.

3.2 What were Its Major Recommendations?

The "major recommendations" of the Report are many, and exactly which should be included in such a grouping easily can become a matter of taste and interest because of the many significant ideas and proposals offered by the

Committee. The proposals dealing with a "stong Mayor-Executive Committee" modification to the Unicity system (#s 8-11) have received the most media attention (see following section). But there are a number of other recommendations which merit the word "major," based on their relevance to Unicity's operations. One of these is the Committee's proposals regarding major changes in the community committees' boundaries and functions (#s 14-6). Another is that Winnipeg adopt a preferential ballot in its civic elections (#17) and in its Council elections (#s 9, 10), retain the at-large election of the Mayor (#18) as well as single-wards for Councillors (#19; although the Committee was split almost evenly on this), and that the number of those wards be reduced to 24 (#16). The Committee recommends a preferential ballot (proportional representation) system (#17), major adjustments to voter qualifications (#21), and a new system for public funding of election expenses (#20). Certainly the proposals for an almost complete overhaul of Part XX of the Act, on planning and land-use regulation procedures, (#s 24-34) are major recommendations, as is the recommendation regarding resurrection of environmental impact statements and reviews (#35). In light of provincial statements, both the proposals on Winnipeg region waterways (#s 36-39) and proposals for elimination of the Additional Zone, along with a proposed new system of regional intergovernmental relations (#s 40 and 41), must be considered major recommendations. In terms of boldness in suggesting additional mechanisms, the major recommendations are the creation of a City Ombudsman and a Municipal Tribunal (#s 59 and 61), but the previous paragraph has indicated some of the other proposals which also can be considered "major." In terms of abolishing existing institutions, we should recognize abolition of the current Standing Committees (#11) and certain boards and commissions (#12).

The following sections give further insights into the overall thrust of the Report's recommendations, as well as indicating what the media, the Mayor, and others identified as the Report's major recommendations.

4.0 REACTIONS, THE PRESENT, AND THE FUTURE

In this section we will examine various reactions to the Committee's Report, where the process of reviewing the Act appears to be at the present time, and what is likely to happen in the future.

4.1 What were the Initial Reactions to the Committee's Report?

There were a number of political journalists who were quite favourable about the Final Report. Former Toronto Mayor John Sewell, who received a copy of the final typed draft via courier just prior to its public unveiling at the January press conference, wrote in the Globe and Mail that "...the report confirms that Winnipeg is blessed with the most serious practical thinking about city government in Canada."[16] Community activist Nick Ternette later wrote in City Magazine that the Report was "....a major landmark study on municipal government which all who are interested in local government in Canada would do well to read."[17]

However, as this latter article points out, local and provincial politicians were not quite so sanguine, and some of the local press stories were quite negative. The Winnipeg Sun led its coverage of the January 13 press conference with the headline "TWO PREMIER PROVINCE: Review Gives More Power To The Mayor" and a story which began, "Manitobans could end up having 'two premiers' if the province accepts a city review committee suggestion to give more power to Winnipeg mayor, says Urban Affairs Minister Larry Desjardins."[18] The article goes on to state that the "crux" of Report "is the creation of 'a presidential-style' mayor and 'a super' six-member concillors' executive." Desjardins is cited as rejecting the Committee's recommendation that civic elections be postponed, "saying his government has no mandate to do that." He is also quoted as saying that the Report "needs an awful lot of study before it can be implemented. In an accompanying article, Mayor Bill Norrie is quoted as calling the strong mayor-executive committee system "schizophrenic," but Commission chairman Cherniack is quoted as saying that the Mayor "mistook some of the checks and balances of the report." The lead Winnipeg Free Press article picked up that theme with its page one story

headlined "Norrie Attacks Flaws in City Hall Reform Plan."[19] It gave a short descriptive summary of the Report's major recommendations and ran a separate article entitled "Province to Study Revisions to Wards," as well as an editorial endorsing Desjardins' statement that the province should soon appoint a commission to review the existing boundaries of city council wards. (Subsequently, the provincial election was called in February, held in March, and a new Minister appointed in April. He announced in May that the Government would not pursue this recommendation prior to further study and the fall civic elections.

Wednesday, January 15, saw a second wave of media reaction. The Committee's Chairman and Secretary appeared on a high profile morning call-in program, which received few calls until the radio talk-show host raised the issues of pensions and the Committee's recommendation to eliminate referenda. On this same day the Winnipeg Free Press published a lead editorial on the Final Report which strongly attacked the Committee's mayor-executive committee proposals--caricaturing them as creating "a municipal dictator," turning "six councillors into the Mayor's chief toadies," and reducing the remaining "18 to trained seals." Cherniack replied a few days later in an article which shared a full page with a longer analysis of the Report by Mayor Bill Norrie.[21]

4.2 What was the Mayor's Analysis?

Research for this paper indicates that the Mayor carefully read the Report and took the time to write his own response which was contained in the above-cited article. It is worth devoting this subsection to, because of its thoughtfulness and its indication of alternative solutions to the problems which the Committee addressed. First, the Mayor praised the Report as "a useful, informative and thoughtful document...(that will)...undoubtedly form the basis of much discussion." However, he cited fears already expressed about various Committee recommendations (such as those cited above), acknowledging: "Probably none of these concerns are valid in the abstract, nor would they be acknowledged by the review committee as its intention. However, in political life perception is almost everything and in the real world of government the achievable takes precedence over theory." He went on

to challenge "why change a political and administrative system which the committee confirms has worked reasonably well?" His answer is that "The review committee appears to have a fixation that the members of Winnipeg city council are really not accountable for their actions...notwithstanding the fact that council terms are shorter, public delegations before committees and council more frequent, and council members more accessible than in provincial or federal systems." Later he muses as to whether a similar review of those systems "might identify the same kind of need for accountability as is seen to be needed at city hall."

Regarding the Committee's specific recommendations on the mayor and council-committee structure, he contends that "The effects of the recommendation purporting to create a strong mayor system are, upon closer examination, more apparent than real....By granting the mayor the sole right to nominate six councillors for membership on the executive committee, the review committee really does little to accomplish its goal....Since nominations would have to be approved by council, the proposal would not establish the mayor in much stronger a position than at present. Indeed, the proposals would create unneeded full-time committee members; create two classes of councillors (with attendant animosities); and grant the potential for establishment of a multiplicity of select committees....As if this would not divide the councillors sufficiently, one of the more surprising recommendations allows for the full-time executive committee to hold (sic:an) unlimited number of secret or private meetings and to withhold information and documents from the councillors who are not members of the...committee...." Mayor Norrie suggests Paul Thomas's "cogent arguments" against abolishing the existing Standing Committees "deserve much consideration since...(they)... serve to inform both councillors and the public on city-wide issues and gives (sic) to them all a forum for the expression of their views."

Mayor Norrie's position is that "City hall is not that ill that it requires the drastic doctoring that is proposed. Meaningful reform could be accomplished by restoring the mayor to the chairmanship of the executive committee; granting to the mayor the authority to appoint the standing committee chairmen (with council approving committee members); providing for

a deputy mayor appointed by the mayor to act as chairman of council; and granting the mayor's office wider day-to-day administrative authority to increase its ability to resolve citizen complaints. These changes, together with a substantial reduction in the size of city council (to 18), would accomplish much by way of improving the council's image and the strengthening of its authority."

He identifies as "one of the most important and helpful sections of the report" that dealing with the provincial-municipal financial relationship (recommendations 1-4), though he regrets that the Committee declined to make precise recommendations, and instead chose to recommend appointment of "yet another study team" to examine the subject. He also endorses major changes to the planning sections of the Act, but expresses reservations about the new roles planned for Community Committees (citing D.I MacDonald's "perceptive analysis of the current role of the community") and the "needs formula," which he contends, "could well detract from the ability or willingness of council to provide additional funds to areas of greatest need." He makes several other comments which will not be reviewed here. All in all, this is the most incisive and cogent evaluation the author has found in this research, and it deserves as serious consideration as the recommendations it critiques.

A few days later, a Winnipeg Free Press editorial endorsed the Review committee's recommendation (#12) on the need for reform of the City's semi-independent boards and commissions--doing so in the context of the Winnipeg Enterprises Corporations's "...giddy whirl with buying into NHL ownership and launching a commercial ticket-sales business--beyond its mandate, without council approval but at risk to the city treasury...."[22] But most of the press coverage quickly turned to other matters, including the provincial election announced in early February for March 21. City Councillors received a copy of the Report and carried on a discussion of some recommendations at a retreat, but it was questionable how many had time to read and respond to the document--Bill Neville, whose earlier contributions were noted above, is the only Councillor who did so to the author's knowledge. Certainly, very few members of the public could carefully consider the contents of the Report, because copies of it--or even the summary of recommendations--were not

available to them, and virtually none of the substance of the Report was provided in the newspapers.

4.3 What Subsequently Happened to the Report and Its Recommendations?

The press coverage quickly moved on to other topics, especially focusing on speculation about, and then the reality of the provincial election campaign held during February and March, 1986. As might be expected, the N.D.P. Government did not commit itself on the Review Committee's recommendations, nor did the Opposition raise any such issues during the campaign. However, the provincial Liberal party, and leader Sharon Carstairs, did announce support for "Amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act...largely along the lines of those suggested in the Cherniack Report."[23] And leader Carstairs, who would be elected, pledged to pursue implementation of those changes as one of her major goals as an M.L.A.[24]

Within a few days in April, 1986 interest in the Committee's Report and recommendations was revived (see Appendix 1). A new Urban affairs Minister was appointed, and at a Public Forum held at The University of Winnipeg on April 19 (hosted by Alan Artibise and the Institute of Urban Studies), he departed from a prepared text to announce that he hoped to expedite the printing and distribution of the printed version of the Report (those attending the Forum had been promised, but did not receive their copies because they were not yet available). He also announced that he desired full public and private consultation on the Report over the next six months, and then would be preparing amendments to be introduced in early 1987. He also indicated his own, and the new Government's interest in improved provincial-City relationships (to be "intelligent and mature"), emphasizing anticipation and planning, rather than reaction and controversy. This theme was underscored by his presence at the Forum next to the Mayor, with whom he had a short time previously, signed agreements on a renewal of Winnipeg's Core Area Initiative. The Forum, attended by 150-200 persons, also included panel/questions-and-answer sessions on most Sections of the Report. The lead-off speaker was the President of the Winnipeg Real Estate Board (which helped fund the Forum), who used the opportunity to warn against re-insertion in the Act of a requirement

that developers submit environmental impact studies (recommendation 35), saying that requiring them was "a step backwards...a potential smokescreen under which the councillors may hide...(using them)...to delay and evade having to make a decision."[25]

The thirty-third Manitoba Legislature began its sitting on May 8 with a Throne Speech which pledged "to change the City of Winnipeg Act and assessment reform."[26] Copies of the printed Report (reduced in size to 124 pages with a handsome design and several maps and charts) were delivered to Committee members on May 13, and they met on May 15 with the Minister, who indicated he wanted them to be further involved in the translation of their ides into formal amendments to the Act.

4.4 Where Do We Go From Here?

As a result of the March elections, the appointment of the new Minister in April, and the committment in the throne speech in May, it is clear that the Report will not be ignored, but rather most probably will be the focus of policy formulation and stimulate amendments to the Act as well as a ward and community committee boundaries review (most likely by a Commission appointed for that purpose). Numerous groups, including most of those represented at the public hearings, and individuals will make use of the opportunity to respond to particular recommendations, as they understand them to be likely or under serious consideration by the Government; and many will appear again at the legislative committee hearings on the actual amendments to the Act which should be taking place in spring or summer of 1987, if the current Government remains in power (it is governing on a majority of only two M.L.A.s). In all, as a newspaper reporter wrote about the Committee's work schedule for 1985; it "promises to be an important period in the history of Winnipeg."[27]

5.0 EVALUATING THIS COMMITTEE'S WORK AND REPORT IN THE CONTEXT OF EVALUATING UNICITY

The Review Committee should be given proper credit for their work. They have produced a first-rate discussion paper which will probably serve as the basis for further development of amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act. From a personal perspective, this author agrees with councillor Neville that "good as it is, its assumptions and rationale deserve to be challenged both by academics and politicians....On the detail of many of the recommendations I disagree strongly....On the general thrust of the report I am generally sympathetic, but I believe they went further in many respects than was necessary or justifiable."[28]

Neville does not believe "that the Report itself identifies problems of a magnitude commensurate with the reforms it proposes;" "allowing for their own finding that the system has apparently worked 'reasonably well,' they nonetheless propose very major changes. And against that , one is bound to recall the signs in British railway stations in wartime, 'is this journey really necessary'?"[29] In addition, he points out that "for vast numbers of people who have only limited or intermittent interest in civic government, each round of new changes often makes the system less intelligible and less accessible."[30]

These points are quite important in the author's professional opinion. The Committee did not systematically indicate whether it researched how its proposals would actually impact on practical politics--either as far as local and provincial politicians, or as far as the public might be affected (although it did meet with local and provincial politicians and bureaucrats in private to discuss at least some of its proposals). The pursuit of accountability and other "good government" principles seems to have led to the same "structural reform" mistake that other such review bodies have found similarly irresistible: basing recommendations on the assumption or rationale that mandate change in structures--institutions and procedures--will change behaviour. This author has demonstrated in both the micro case study of Winnipeg and the macro level of North American metropolitan reform that the relationship between ideas, institutional change, and local political behaviour is not as direct as that orientation assumes.[31]

What is neglected is the practical or "real world" of Unicity's actual operations and politics. Therefore, a gap is created "between the Report as a study and the realities of urban government as it is experienced and lived, not only by its politicians and bureaucrats, but by the people who actually reside in the City of Winnipeg."[32] The focus becomes shortcomings in relation to abstract principles such as "accountability," or particular institutional problems, rather than the actual working contexts and experiences of City government. For example, in considering access of citizens, the myriad contacts with local politicians are not mentioned, but the (legitimately serious) problem of French Language service for official City phone numbers is focused on. An ombudsman and municipal tribunal are recommended to deal with this and other problems. For those of us who know or carefully study the City political experience, many facets of reality are missing.

In order to properly evaluate and prescribe for Unicity, it would seem reasonable to expect that the realities of City and provincial politics should be recognized and the costs (as well as the suggested benefits) of any proposed change should be carefully weighed in these terms. The achievements of the past should be recognized, and the present good level of operations should be clearly protected and developed. Where possible, co-operation and networking should be encouraged, rather than the imposition of different and new institutional mechanisms of unproven benefit and unknown impacts on the existing system. This does not mean there should be no further innovation, only that further innovation should be carefully evaluated and proven to be unharmful to the public intelligibility, as well as actually being able to do what it claims, before actually being legislated into institutional existence.

But it is no doubt unfair to expect the Review Committee to have been this precise within its terms of reference. It could have only tried a bit harder to resist the temptation to simply propose further studies and structural changes. In this regard, particularly outstanding are the efforts of Donald Epstein to promote a co-operative approach between provincial, City, and rural municipal officials to solving regional land-use problems. This is probably one the most innovative facets of the Committee's Report and the Province should carefully continue and develop the kind of networking necessary to

develop this process further. The same advice can be given in regard to better provincial-City relations. Again, it will probably be less the Report, and more the current elected officials at both levels who will determine the developments in this area. Finally, there is the Committee's main focus, the Act. In this regard also, the Committee's work is a contribution, though certainly not the final, and possibly not the most important, component. Much politics will take place before the Act is amended. Certainly that is one clear lesson from the experience of translating both the original proposals and the 1976 recommendations into legislation. In other words, while the Report chapter of this political saga may be concluded, there is still much of the past and all of the continuing story to unfold.

6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The province of Manitoba in 1984 appointed a five-member Review Committee to review the City of Winnipeg Act, and five specific areas of concern to the Government. After an extended process of public hearings, private consultations, and review of materials, the Committee produced a lengthy Report which was formally released in January, 1985 and whose printed version has been distributed as this paper was finished in early May, 1986. It appears that the Committee's work and its Report have had, and will have, a significant impact on provincial revisions to the Act. However, its impact on city politics and governing is still unclear. To date reaction to it has been mostly to ignore it or to react negatively to some of its more striking recommendations--notably those for creation of a strong mayor-executive committee system, and for extensive modification of ward and community committee boundaries. But extensive response is likely in the context of the announced provincial priority attached to amendment of the Act in 1987. Therefore, this Committee must be viewed as a success in terms of operations and reactions to it. However, there remains the need for much more data collection and systematic evaluation in order to make a fair evaluation of Unicity as an innovation in urban government.

NOTES

1. David Morley; Stuart Proudfoot; and Thomas Burns, ed., Making Cities Work: The Dynamics of Urban Innovation (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980); Donald C. Rowat, ed., International Handbook of Local Government Reorganization (Westport, Conn.,: Greenwood Press, 1980); Arthur B. Gunlicks, ed., Local Government Reform and Reorganization: An International Perspective (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kinnicat Press, 1981); Stanley Scott and Victor Jones, "Forward," in Metropolitan Winnipeg: Politics and Reform of Local Government, ed., Meyer Brownstone and T.J. Plunkett (Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press, 1983), xv-xxix; Philip Wichern, "Metropolitan Reform and the Restructuring of Local Governments in the North American City," in Power and Place: Canadian Urban Development in the North American Context, ed. Gilbert A. Stelter and Alan F.J. Artibise (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986).

2. Proudfoot summarizing Axworthy in Morley, Proudfoot and Burns, Making Cities Work, 178.

3. Matthew J. Kiernan and David C. Walker, "Winnipeg," in City Politics in Canada, ed. Warren Magnusson and Andrew Sancton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), 229.

4. Brownstone and Plunkett, Metropolitan Winnipeg.

5. Committee of Review, City of Winnipeg Act, Report and Recommendations (Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1976).

6. P.H. Wichern, "Winnipeg's Civic Political History and the Logic of Structural Reform," Urban History Review/Revue d'histoire urbaine, VII (1978):111-121; Phil H. Wichern, Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity Government: Past Efforts and Present Challenges (Winnipeg: Institute of Urban Studies, Research and Working Paper No. 9, 1984).

7. Phil H. Wichern, Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity Government: Past Efforts and Present Challenges; Phil H. Wichern, Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity: Citizen Participation and Resident Advisory Groups, 1971-1984 (Winnipeg: Institute of Urban Studies, Research and Working Paper No. 11, 1984); Philip H. Wichern, "The Committee's Mandate and Good Urban Governing," remarks prepared for delivery to the City of Winnipeg Act Review Committee, Public Hearing on 11 January 1985; Dr. Philip H. Wichern, "Provincial/Municipal Relations for a Better Unicity," brief prepared for delivery to the City of Winnipeg Act Review Committee, Public Hearing on 19 February 1985; Dr. Philip H. Wichern, "Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity: Scholarly and Practical Perspectives," paper prepared for the 1985 Canadian Urban Studies Conference, held at The University of Winnipeg, 19 August 1985.

8. City of Winnipeg Act, Review Committee, Final Report 1986 (Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1986), 3.

9. Committee of Review, Report and Recommendations.

10. City of Winnipeg Act, Review Committee, "Draft Report," (Winnipeg: Review Committee, 1985, mimeo), 120-124.

11. Transcript of 13 March 1985 hearing, 6-7.

12. "Presentation...by Concerned Citizens of the Community of St. Ignatius," 5; included in the transcript cited in footnote 11.

13. City of Winnipeg Act, Review Committee, Final Report, 1.

14. Wichern, "Provincial/Municipal Relations for a Better Unicity."

15. City of Winnipeg Act, Review Committee, Final Report, 7.

16. John Sewell, Globe and Mail, 14 January 1986, A5.

17. Nick Ternette, "A Manifesto for Urban Reform," City Magazine VIII (Spring 1986): 6.

18. Winnipeg Sun, 14 January 1986, 11.

19. Winnipeg Free Press, 14 January 1986, 1.

20. "Boundaries Won't Change Until Election," Winnipeg Free Press, 5 May 1986, 3.

21. "Issues: Debating Civic Reform," Winnipeg Free Press, 19 January 1986, 7.

22. Winnipeg Free Press, 22 January 1986, 6.

23. Campaign '86: "Winnipeg Urban Policy Priorities" paper, 4.

24. Radio newscasts, 30 March 1986.

25. Winnipeg Real Estate News, 25 April 1986, 1-2.

26. Winnipeg Free Press, 9 March 1986, 1.

27. Jim Carr, "City Hall Gets Close Scrutiny," Winnipeg Free Press, 6 December 1984, 7.

28. William Neville, comments at the presentation of an earlier draft of this paper.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. Wichern, Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity Government: Past Efforts and

Present Challenges; Wichern, "Metropolitan Reform and the Restructuring of Local Governments."

32. William Neville, comments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Committee of Review, City of Winnipeg Act. Report and Recommendations. Winnipeg: Queen's Printer, 1976.

Gunlicks, Arthur B., editor. Local Government Reform and Reorganization: An International Perspective. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kinnicat Press, 1981.

Kiernan, Matthew J. and David C. Walker. "Winnipeg." In City Politics in Canada, ed. Warren Magnusson and Andrew Sancton, 222-254. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.

Morley, David; Stuart Proudfoot; and Thomas Burns, ed. Making Cities Work: The Dynamics of Urban Innovation. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980.

Rowat, Donald C., ed. International Handbook of Local Government Reorganization. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980.

Scott, Stanley and Victor Jones. "Forward." In Metropolitan Winnipeg: Politics and Reform of Local Government, ed. Meyer Brownstone and T.J. Plunkett, xv-xxix. Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press, 1983.

Wichern, P.H. "Winnipeg's Civic Political History and the Logic of Structural Reform," Urban History Review/Revue d'histoire urbaine VII (1978): 111-121.

Wichern, Phil H. Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity Government: Past Efforts and Present Challenges. Winnipeg: Institute of Urban Studies, Research and Working Paper No. 9, 1984a.

Wichern, Phil H. Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity: Citizen Participation and Resident Advisory Groups, 1971-1984. Winnipeg: Institute of Urban Studies, Research and Working Paper No. 11, 1984b.

Wichern, Philip H. "The Committee's Mandate and Good Urban Governing." Remarks prepared for delivery to the City of Winnipeg Act Review Committee, Public Hearing on 11 January 1985a.

Wichern, Dr. Philip H. "Provincial/Municipal Relations for a Better Unicity." Brief prepared for the City of Winnipeg Act Review Committee, Public Hearing, 19 February 1985b.

Wichern, Dr. Philip H. "Evaluating Winnipeg's Unicity: Scholarly and Practical Perspectives." Paper prepared for the 1985 Canadian Urban Studies Conference, held at The University of Winnipeg, 19 August 1985c.

Wichern, Philip. "Metropolitan Reform and the Restructuring of Local Governments in the North American City." In Power and Place: Canadian Urban Development in the North American Context, ed. Gilbert A. Stelter and Alan F.J. Artibise. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986.

APPENDIX 1. CHRONOLOGY OF CITY OF WINNIPEG ACT REVIEW COMMITTEE

April, 1983: Idea of an Act review "later this year" emerges from meeting of the Urban Affairs Committee of Cabinet with Official Delegation from the City (letter from Mayor to City Councillors), development of the idea by Minister of Urban Affairs, Urban Affairs Committee of Cabinet, Department of Urban affairs officials.

October, 1983: City advised of Province's intent to name 3 members to a Committee of Review.

April 11, 1984: Order-In-Council 448/84 formally appoints the Committee, "pursuant to the provisions of Section 660 of The City of Winnipeg Act...to review:

(a) the operation of The City of Winnipeg Act, being Chapter 105 of the Statutes of Manitoba as amended, with the exception of Part VIII-Assessment;

(b) the activities of the City of Winnipeg under the provisions of the said Act;

(c) the effectiveness of the provisions of The City of Winnipeg Act with respect to:

i) the distribution of responsibilities and powers between the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba;

ii) the distribution of responsibilities and powers for reconciling both local and City-wide interest within the City of Winnipeg;

iii) the relationships between the City, municipalities in the additional zone, and municipalities and planning districts adjacent to the City and the additional zone;

iv) city planning, particularly in Part XX of the Act; and

v) meaningful citizen participation in city decision-making processes."

The Order directed the Committee "to report its findings and recommendations to the Lieutenant Governor in Council on or before August 31, 1985" (a delivery date extended 3 months by O.-I.-C. 1078/85--see September

18, 1985 below). The Order also appointed five Committee members--Alan Artibise, Lawrie Cherniack, Donald Epstein, Neil McGregor, Paul Thomas--and named Cherniack the Chairperson of the Committee. The Order also provided for honoraria ($225 per diem for Chairperson, $200 for other members), and various other expenses. The Order also instructed the Committee "...in conducting its review..,(to)...hold public meetings and...meet with such persons and organizations as the committee may consider desirable."

May-August, 1984: 5 S.T.E.P.-funded students prepare background papers for the Committee, under overall direction of Special Advisor To The Minister, David Sanders.

June 20, 1984: Order-In-Council 737/84 revokes the appointment of Neil McGregor and appoints former City Chief Commissioner, D.I. MacDonald.

July, 1984: Minister brings Committee together for first meeting.

August, 1984: Selection and formal appointment (by Civil Service Commission) of Committee Secretary and staff, as well as negotiation and approval of budget.

September, 1984: Preparation and printing of a pamphlet inviting participation, initial private discussions with interested individuals, consideration of research possibilities, etc.

October-November, 1984: Preparation and printing of 3,000 copies of a thirty-four page four-toned, illustrated Issues Paper entitled "Our City in Review" (French language edition, Notre ville a l'etude), providing background information, questions, problems, and alternative options for problem-solving in each of six issue areas (citizen participation, the additional zone, provincial-municipal relations, political and administrative organization, and planning). The paper invited written responses and/or oral presentations at a schedule of hearings to take place in January, February, March, and April, 1985.

Fall, 1984-June, 1985: The Committee "...met privately with individuals whom we hoped would be able to provide some special insights...lawyers, planners, current and retired politicians at all levels, business persons, current and retired civic and provincial employees, and academics...more than 150 people." (Report, 4).

December, 1984: Alan Artibise authored, and the Institute of Urban Studies (at University of Winnipeg, of which he was the Director) published, a study of City property tax assessments indicating major inequalities between City and suburban properties. On his weekly CBC local affairs commentary, Artibise mentions the possibility of legal action against the City on behalf of inner-City property-owners in discussing his study. Subsequently, Mayor Bill Norrie writes two letters to the Premier demanding he be removed because "of his involvement in possible legal action against the city" (Winnipeg Free Press, 29 December 1984, 3): in the second he says the City's Board of Commissioners will not "...appear either privately or in public before the...committee." (While he announces this, members of the Committee are having lunch with one of the Commissioners in a nearby restaurant.)

Early January, 1985: The Winnipeg Free Press editorializes against the Mayor ("Snubbing the Committee," 3 January 1985, 3). Veteran N.D.P. Councillor Alan Wade files notice of a City Council motion echoing Norrie's demands (Winnipeg Free Press, 10 January 1985, 3), but after private discussions and some public reactions from fellow councillors, he withdraws it. The Acting Urban Affairs Minister rejects Norrie's pleas and arguments, and Norrie vows to boycott the Committeee's hearings, the first of which is scheduled the next day at City Hall (Winnipeg Free Press 10 January 1985, 1).

January 11, 1985: First of what will be 29 public hearings (15 are initially scheduled) during the next four months, begun by Councillor Wade (appearing in support of the Committee), followed by well-known Councillor Joe Zuken, and the author of this paper ("Review Panel Begins Hearings, without Mayor," Winnipeg Free Press, 12 January 1985, 3). The battle of the absent Artibise (he was mercifully away during this period) continues with a letter to the editor from the City Solicitor supporting the Mayor and calling the 1/3

editorial "dishonorable" ("Council Controversy," Winnipeg Free Press, 12 January 1985, 7), to which the Winnipeg Free Press issues a strong editorial reply, saying the whole affair has "...left the pouting mayor and sulking councillors looking foolish and fearful," and suggesting that the City Solicitor "...resign if he seriously meant what he said." (14 January 1985, 6).

January-February: After a series of private meetings, the papers announce that the Mayor is ready to meet with the review committee (26 January 1985), the City Commissioners are said to have "flip-flopped" into co-operation (21 February 1985), and the "snit (is) snuffed" according to the Winnipeg Sun, "...Councillors can live with Artibise" (11 March 1985). Generally favourable reports appear on the Committee's public hearings throughout this period.

March 13, 1985: "..high point in the public hearing phase occurred when we were invited to receive the (17) briefs of core area residents and social service agencies at Rossbrook House, a native community centre (on this evening)...A number of briefs that touched questions far beyond our mandate remain a particularly bright memory...." (Report, 6).

Spring, 1985: The Committee conducted an unsuccessful questionnaire survey of 89 former and present City Councillors, receiving back only 16 (perhaps partially attributable to the length and design of the questionnaire). It also commissioned a 400 interview public opinion survey, the responses of which begin with 74.8 per cent claiming to vote in municipal elections. Perhaps that suggests why the Report contains little reference to this survey, and its full results are nowhere included. Several "in house" papers were commissioned on such topics as citizen participation, city structure, and planning. Donald Epstein pursued private meetings with City and additional zone municipal officials in an effort to build a basis for a mechanism of practical co-operation during this period.

May 13, 1985: The committee met at the City's retreat at Indian Bay (where the City-Indian Band struggle over land use control around the intake for Winnipeg's sole water source is the big issue). There a modified Delphi

technique was used to facilitate the development of consensus around options and recommendations which were organized around the issues and the discussion in the original issues paper.

Summer, 1985: It became clear that the Committee could not meet the August 31 deadline for their Report. Authority was sought to extend the Committee's term to November 30th.

September, 1985: Newspaper articles begin to announce some of the predilections of the Committee (such as Fred Young's article, "Mayoral Vote Plan Rejected, Sources Reveal," Winnipeg Free Press, 9 September 1985). The Committee was holding private consultations on its draft recommendations with various individuals and groups, including City politicians and a group of Opposition M.L.A.s.

September 18: Order-In-Council 1078/85 extended the Committee's term to November 30. Committee Secretary Gordon Mackie and Donald Epstein "...took on the major role of coordinating, editing and writing the final version of most of this Report" (Report, viii).

December 3: Chairman Cherniack is quoted as fearing "government interference in preparation of (the) report, because the province has held up approval of the $25,000 to $30,000 required to design and print the Report which is to be presented to the Minister the next day. He is quoted as saying, "In its present form, it's only readable by somebody who knows the City of Winnipeg Act or is very familiar with the structure of the City's government." He wants to add "graphs, illustrations and other features to make it readily understandable to the general public." Winnipeg Free Press, 3 December 1985, 3). The Minister indicates he looks forward to publicly releasing the Report; 2000 copies will be printed (the committee wanted an initial run of 5,000 copies), of which 1900 will be available through the Department of Urban Affairs. This means the Committee's plans for broad distribution will not be followed.

January 10, 1986: at the Mayor's weekly press conference, the media hears that the Government has scheduled a press conference to release draft copies and summaries of the Report the following Monday. However, the Committee staff (in their last days of employment) cannot confirm this, as they are instructed that the Government Information Service will make the announcement as to when and where the press conference will take place. There is apparently concern about the Mayor "upstaging" the Report, and the Minister "definitely doesn't want the Mayor at the press conference." At least some of media are finally told informally where the Committee will be at what times on Monday.

January 13, 1986: The Information Service announces the press conference in the morning, the Committee enjoys a final lunch together at a major hotel, and moves to a suite where the formal press release and party takes place. Some draft copies of the 348 page Report are made available (a copy was sent by courier to John Sewell at the Globe and Mail in Toronto the previous Friday). Both the Minister and Norrie express some reservations which become the major focus of some news reports (see Appendix A). The Minister flatly rejects one Committee recommendation—that the October, 1986 civic elections be delayed until other recommendations of the Report are implemented.

January 15, 1986: On a usually active morning call-in radio program, the Committee's chairman and secretary initially receive no calls; but the talk-show host manages to stimulate a discussion of the idea of referenda (which the Committee rejected). The calls pick up, and later in the program, the chairman indicates that the Committee "...intends to pressure whatever government is elected to take action on the Report." A similar afternoon program goes a bit better. D.I. MacDonald suggests Alan Artibise hold a follow up public forum through the Institute of Urban Studies to keep up public interest.

February-March 1986: The low-key provincial election campaigns of the N.D.P. and P.C. parties do not mention the Report, but provincial Liberal leader Sharon Carstairs says one of her goals as an M.L.A. will be pursuing implementation of changes to the City of Winnipeg Act along the lines of the

Committee's Report (20 March 1986 newscasts), and her party issues a "Winnipeg Urban Policy Priorities" paper saying there is "...a municipal reform agenda which should be tackled immediately" which includes Carstairs' above-cited goal. (Carstairs was elected, as was a two-seat N.D.P. majority, which means the existing structure of the Department of Urban Affairs will probably remain intact.)

Early April, 1986: A new Minister of Urban Affairs is announced, along with other members of the new Cabinet. He is a newcomer to provincial politics who will hold this portfolio only, in contrast to the previous Minister who held several.

April 19, 1986: The Institute of Urban Studies (supported by the Winnipeg Real Estate Board) presents a public forum, "Our City Reviewed," designed to "...allow citizens to discuss and evaluate the recommended changes..." suggested by the Committee in its Report. All participants were to receive copies of the printed Report, but they are not available to the approximately 150 who attended. (Delays are privately attributed to translation, Queen's Printer staff changes, and other technical delays). The new Minister appears on a mid-morning panel, saying that the revision of the Act is a priority with the Government, that he looks forward to getting printed copies of the Report out, studying it himself, meeting with all interested parties on it, drafting actual amendments to the Act, and introducing the legislation sometime in 1987. On this same day the N.D.P. municipal party officials met with the Premier and provincial party officials "...in an effort to diffuse what some N.D.P. members are calling a party crisis," in part attributable to the perception that "...the municipal wing has grown increasingly alienated from the provincial wing, primarily because of disagreements on such municipal issues as reforms to the City of Winnipeg Act and the city-side property tax assessment ("Winnipeg Free Press, "Civic N.D.P. in Revolt," 19 April 1986, 3).

May 2, 1986: The Urban affairs Minister announces that the Government will not review ward boundaries before the next civic election, as the previous Minister had suggested was possible. He says "he wants to set up a system in which an independent commission would conduct regular, automatic reviews of

civic ward boundaries...(and)...by waiting until after the election, the government will not only be able to deal with the size of council at the same time, but will be able to use 1986 census figures in drawing the boundaries...(also)..the government wants to deal with all aspects of the City of Winnipeg Act at the same time. He also "hopes the committee recommendations can be subjected to public debate over the next four to five months, and legislative changes can go ahead early next year" (Winnipeg Free Press, 5 May 1986, 3).

May 8, 1986: The Government Throne Speech announces a committment to "change the City of Winnipeg Act and assessment reform" (Winnipeg Free Press, 9 May 1986, 1). Members of the Committee are scheduled to meet the Minister May 15, and copies of the printed Report are expected to be distributed before that time.

IUS PUBLICATIONS

REPORTS

The Evolution of Urban Canada: An Analysis of Approaches and Interpretations, Report No. 4, by A.F.J. Artibise and P.-A. Linteau.
Housing Canada's Seniors, Report No. 14, by S. Goldblatt, F. Cates and J. Phillips.
Public Transit and the Public Interest: An Empirical Evaluation of Two Administrative Models, Report No. 15, by F. Frisken.
Community Economic Development: An Approach for Urban-Based Economies, Report No. 16, by L. Newman, D. Lyon and W. Philp.

RESEARCH AND WORKING PAPERS

Canadian Towns and Villages: An Economic Profile, 1981, Research and Working Paper No. 14, by M. Qadeer and K. Chinnery.
The Neighbourhood Improvement Program, 1973-1983: A National Review of an Intergovernmental Initiative, Research and Working Paper No. 15, by D. Lyon and L. Newman.
Housing Subsidies in a Period of Restraint: The Canadian Experience, 1973-1984, Research and Working Paper No. 16, by J.D. Hulchanski and G. Drover.
The Expenditure Budget Process in Canadian Municipalities: A Comparison, Research and Working Paper No. 18, by D. Amborski.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

Federal Housing Policies in the 1980s/La politique federale de l'habitation des annees 1980, Occasional Paper No. 12, by The Honourable William McKnight.
Municipal Non-Profit Housing: Winnipeg Housing Rehabilitation Corporation, Occasional Paper Nods. 13, by L. Newman.
Cities in the 21st Century, Occasional Paper No. 14, by G. Gappert.
Main Street Canada: Urban Conservation in Small Town Downtown, Occasional Paper No. 15, by G. Fulton.

URBAN RESOURCES SERIES

The Windsor Municipal Archives: Heritage Development in Hard Times, Urban Resources Series No. 1, by M. Walsh.

A complete listing of IUS Publications is available on request. For more information, contact:

INSTITUTE OF URBAN STUDIES
University of Winnipeg
515 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3B 3E9 CANADA

THE INSTITUTE OF URBAN STUDIES

The Institute of Urban Studies (IUS) was created by the University of Winnipeg in 1969 at a time when the city's "urban university" perceived a need to address the problems and concerns of the inner city. From the outset, IUS was both an academic research centre and an innovative, action-oriented community resource. While the Institute has always been committed to examining urban development issues in a broad context, it has never lost sight of the demands of applied research aimed at practical, often novel, solutions to urban problems.

The Institute of Urban Studies is a multiple-function centre that undertakes to encourage, facilitate and engage in independent, multi-disciplinary research on urban or urban-related topics (including housing, community and neighbourhood development, urban policy and government, and social-demographic issues); to promote and engage in formal and informal education and community outreach programs (including an undergraduate urban studies majors program, workshops, conferences, seminars, etc.); and to conduct mission-oriented and applied research.

The Institute has an active publications program that includes a scholarly journal, a quarterly newsletter, major reports, research and working papers, monographs, and occasional publications.

The Institute is an institutional member of the following organizations: the Social Science Federation of Canada, the Canadian Urban Transit Association, the Urban Land Institute, the Urban Affairs Association, the International New Towns Association, the International Federation for Housing and Planning, the Association of Regional and Urban Planning Programs at Canadian Universities, the Canadian Council on Social Development, the Canadian Urban History Association, the International Downtown Executives Association, the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, the Downtown Winnipeg Association, and several other local or regional bodies.

For further information on any aspect of the Institute, please contact:

Dr. Alan F.J. Artibise, Director
Institute of Urban Studies
University of Winnipeg
515 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 2E9
Canada

Telephone: (204) 786-9409